A Muslim's Defense of Islam Part 1

A Muslim's Defense of Islam

2007/07/29

Mr Sina,
Sorry. Just confirming that you have read this first part before i move on. Have noted quite a few FFI members commenting. Nothing of much material from them as such. I would request this debate remain between you and me. Inshallah, both of us should be more knowledgeable in due course. I thank you, sir,

Zuher

Ali Sina,
Greetings.
I have started going through the website and trying to steal time, a few minutes here and there, going through the various debates you have had. I must say, the arguments posed at you by your opponents, were pretty lame and very frail to say the least. No wonder, your upper hand in most of them.

However, as a point of order, Mr Sina, I shall only concentrate on your alleged incoherence and contradictory nature of injunctions of the Holy Qura'n, with no reference to Ahadith from any of the Sahih of the Alhul Sunna. I am not a Sunni, but a Shia Muslim and so I do certainly believe that many of the quotations in Sahih are flawed and of dubious origin. Of course, I lay no blame on you for using them to push your point against Islam, as I have noted, but just as general comment after an observation. I cannot defend what is not true and to me, a book that already contains one error will not be defended in a fool proof manner. So I shall keep to the injunctions of the Holy Qur'an alone. In my mind, the Great Book has its own Protector. All I will be doing is just bringing a very tiny speck of the knowledge of the book into light. I am sure that tiny speck, will be blinding light to many a doubting Thomas'.

Dear Mr. Zuher,

So you think that if a book contains one error, it should not be accepted in its entirety, therefore the books of ahadith must be disregarded altogether because they contain some fabricated hadith. You want to stick to the Quran alone, which you consider to be error free.

Allow me to show the fallacy of this argument. The Books of hadith are collections of stories about Muhammad. The narrators were humans. Humans are fallible, nonetheless, we do not reject everything they say just because they are sometimes wrong. There is not a single book that is error free. Shall we discard them all? It is a fallacy to say just because we find

errors in the books of hadith we should throw everything away. Let us say a criminal is interrogated. Should the court throw out all his testimony because on many occasions he has been found lying?

This argument that since some of the ahadith are forgeries, we must discard all of them, is a fallacy. Our task is to read them critically. It is not difficult to separate false ahadith from the authentic ones. For a believer, this may be the case, because it is hard for him to be objective, but for a critical examiner it is not an impossible task. For example, there are many ahadith attributing miracles to Muhammad. Shall we accept them as true or as forgeries? The answer is that they are all forgeries. Why? It is because the Quran says that Muhammad did not perform any miracles and that the Quran is his only miracle. We can use this evidence as Muhammad's confession that he never performed any miracles. There are also many ahadith that portray Muhammad as a thug, a thief, a rapist, a mass murderer, an assassin, a pedophile, etc. What is the verdict on these kinds of ahadith? The answer is that they are most likely true. Why? It is because although it is expected for believers to attribute false stories to their prophet claiming miracles for him, it is unlikely that they will lie collectively to make their beloved prophet look like a villain. Furthermore, the stories of Muhammad's dastardly crimes come to us from chains of narrators, at times belonging to antagonistic schools of thoughts, and yet they corroborate one another. The differences between them are in details, which is understandable because memories fail. However, just because there are several version of a story, we cannot dismiss all the ahadith because they differ in details. For example, there are several versions of the massacre of the Bani Quraiza. The numbers of people slaughtered, vary from 600 to 900. This discrepancy is understandable. Memories fail in details. However, it is irrational to say that because of this discrepancy we cannot be sure whether such a massacre ever happened. No one can prove with certainty how many people Saddam Hussein killed. Does this mean that he was innocent of all the charges of genocide?

Books written by humans can contain errors. These errors do not invalidate everything those books say. However, if a book claimed to be the verbatim word of God contains one single error that claim becomes refuted. Therefore, even though we know that the books of ahadith contain many false hadiths, we must not dismiss them, but rather try to separate the false ones from the authentic ones, which is not that difficult. The books of ahadith are biographies of Muhammad. They are not holy books but books of history. We must refer to them if we want to learn about the historic Muhammad. There is no other source to learn about him. On the other hand, the Quran must be discarded as a divine book, because a divine book should not have even one error. There are hundreds of errors in the Quran. This is a huge flaw in Muslim thinking. Hundreds of errors do not invalidate the books of hadith as sources of history, but a single error in the Quran invalidates it as a divine book.

> At the same time, I have also noted that your website contains pictures of disturbing nature and you call them “This is Islam”. As a facet to our argument, I assure you, Mr Sina, I shall not Google for a picture of a white collobus monkey, and say this is a Canadian, in a manner, depicting evolution. Or probably surf for a picture of Hitler, Mussolini or Stalin and say this is a typical European. Or bring a picture of Idi Amin, Mobutu Seseko, Jean Bedel Bokassa or Robert Mugabe and say “This is Africa ”. That would be childish over generalisation of facts that are only characteristic of a certain individual or group of people within certain time bound, geopolitical environ and not a synonym to ideals of a total mass of people under a particular country, continent, race or religion, in an epoch, for that matter. We can find such negative elements in any socio-cultural, geopolitical, religious setting and they are never representative of the whole mass. In all fairness, no one with even a speck of scholarly aptitude, as you profess, would make such sweeping generalisations on a mass of people and ideals, after observing the acts of a few negative elements existent within a people under diverse socio-geopolitical backdrop. Hence generalising Islam on characters such as Bin Laden or Saddam Hussein is prejudiced and iniquitous, at the very least.

If all the apples on a tree are good and only one or a few are bad, it is unfair to say the tree is bad. However, if you see that the tree produces nothing but bad apples, year in year out, then it is fair to say that the problem is with the tree.

Bad people exist in all religions. Nonetheless they are often the exceptions and they are bad because they do not follow the good teachings of their religion. In Islam bad people are the majority. According to Sheikh Palazzi, 90% of the mosques preach hate. He is being conservative. Tell me which mosque does not preach hate. Sheikh Palazzi himself was full of hate and rage when I cordially invited him for an interview. I actually thought since he does not hate the Jews, he may also not hate the apostates. I was wrong. In another email that he sent to a friend, he showered me with the most venomous vituperations. However, let us be conservative and say only 90% of the mosques preach hate. This means that 90% of Muslims who go to the mosques and listen to the sermons are exposed to hate. Some of them may take those sermons to heart, become full of hate and eventually terrorists.

Not all Muslims are hate mongers. However, it is fair to say that most of those who take their religion seriously are. There are also wonderful and peaceful Muslims; nonetheless you would have a hard time finding them in a mosque. If you want to find good people among Muslims, look among the non-practicing non-believing members. Muslims are most dangerous when they come out of the mosques and after they listen to the fiery sermons of their mullahs. It does not take a genius to see the problem is Islam. The more Muslims believe in Islam and practice it the more barbaric and dangerous they become. If some Muslims are not bad people, it is because they are not good Muslims. And let us cut the PC crap and be honest. It is not true that the majority of Muslims are good people. The majority of them are actually bad people. How can we deny the effect of 1400 years of indoctrination of sheer evil on Muslims and their culture?

> As you advocate for objective and not subjective dialogue, such generalised references to a group of people is typical of subjection and not objectivity. The acts depicted therein are not necessarily representative of Islam. Islam, as per my initial request, is a set of ideals elaborated in the Holy Qur'an. Any deviation from the Remembrance, may it be on an individual or group level, is not Islam and not part of our debate. I cannot defend what my own brother does, if it does not conform to set moral standards and his actions will never be illustrative of me, my family or set ideals and moral standards. The apple, Mr. Sina, does fall far from the tree some times. You exemplify that, in a manner of speaking, as regards your background. You were a Muslim once were u not? Our argumentative yard stick is the Holy Qur'an and its ideals.

I think we both agree that the focus of our discussion should be on the Quran. You believe that those bad Muslims are those who fall from the tree of Islam while I am here to prove that those bad Muslims are bad because they take the Quran seriously.

> Further, Mr Sina, I shall not defend any of your opponents in your debates as their flow of thought will not match mine in any circumstance. I will, however, make use of your chronology of arguments wherever you may have mentioned them in your debates with your opponents.
>
> However, I will request you to be patient with my slowness in argumentation as I am a protracted reader and drowned to my neck with my PhD thesis. I am not a Muslim scholar per se but I am confident my arguments would be more concrete than the ones I have read on your website. I reiterate, as a scholar, I shall maintain decorum and prudence in writing not to hit below the belt as I have seen many of your debates akin to the same. As scholars, we maintain simplicity in arguments as a show of intelligence and respect. I consider you as my adversary, not my enemy and I would like to think that I can be rest assured of the same, as regards to you.

As for your confidence in having all the answers, I am afraid it stems from your unduly placed faith in a bankrupt ideology. Of course for one who is convinced that Islam is from God, it is hard to accept that Islam has no answers. You assume the reason Muslim scholars have failed to disprove me is because they did not have enough knowledge. That is a wrong assumption. You too will fail, not because you are not a skilful debater but because you have embarked on an impossible mission. Islam is a lie. How can you prove a lie? You may be able to misguide gullible people who don't know anything about Islam and with lies portray for them a deceptive picture of Islam. This is a trick you can't play on us. There have been a few westerners who have been fooled in believing that Islam is peaceful, beautiful, sweet and gentle, etc. Most of them eventually see the truth and leave Islam to become its staunch critics. However, you have zero chance of fool us with lies. So I strongly advise you not to even try. You would be shooting yourself in the foot. I will disrobe you from all the lies leaving you bare naked in the public. You don't want that kind of embarrassment. Just be rational and logical but do not try to win the day with lies. It just won't work with me.

> Mr Sina, if I do sense a trend of argumentation based on obstinacy and deliberate disregard to logic and explanations given, I will consider the debate void of any purposeful continuance. Both of us should be expected to accept where a point has been made or argued out well. It’s part of being a scholar to know where one has gone wrong and correct the error to mould into a better person, more knowledgeable and wiser.

I am not obstinate. My debates are published for everyone to see. If you have objective proof to back your claim I will accept it. Just do not expect me to bow down to any absurdity because you repeat it ad nauseam or you believe it fervently. We both make our points and move on. Our readers will be the jury. I do not expect you to agree with what I say and you shouldn't either. Let the public decide. My objective is not to mold you. Your life is yours and it is up to you to decide whether you want to become a better person or not. My objective is to expose the fallacy of Islam. I suggest you also relinquish the thought of molding me. Your job is to defend Islam and prove me wrong in the arena of public opinion. Whether I accept your arguments or not, should not be of your concern. Your objective is to convince our readers that Islam is true.

I shall start straight away with your recommended debate with Mr Ghamidi & Mr Zaheer and we shall embark on chronology in staggering our arguments. As was your approach, I begin with intercession.

Volume 1: Surah Baqarah, Verses 47-48

O Children of Israel ! call to mind My favor which I bestowed on you and that I made you excel the nation (47). And be on your guard against the day when one soul shall not avail another in the least; neither shall intercession on its behalf be accepted, nor shall any compensation be taken from it, nor shall they be helped (48). And be on your guard against the day when one soul shall not avail another in the least:

The temporal power and authority, with all its various systems and varying conditions, is based on a necessity of life - the only justification of this institution is that it fulfils this need in the framework of the prevailing factors of the society. It some times exchanges a commodity for another, gives up a benefit for another, substitutes an order with another - without any hard and fast criterion to regulate- such dispensations. The same phenomenon is observed in their judiciary. Logically, a crime must be recompensed with punishment. Yet some times the judge, because of some extraneous reasons, decides not to punish the criminal. Some times the criminal rouses in the judge an overwhelming feeling of pity by his passionate appeal for mercy. Or he wins him over by bribe which induces him to deliver an unjust judgment. Or an influential man intercedes with the judge on behalf of the said criminal and the judge cannot ignore that intercession. Or, the said criminal becomes a state witness leading to the conviction of even greater criminals, and is himself, thus, released without any punishment. Or his tribe or colleagues get him freed from the clutches of the authorities. Whatever the cause may be, it is a well-established custom in the worldly governments and human societies to let the wrong-doers go free at times.

The ancient tribes and the idol-worshippers believed that the life hereafter was an extension of this one; that the customs of this world were valid for that one too, and that the next world was permeated by the same actions and reactions which prevailed in this one. Thus they offered sacrifices and offerings to their deities seeking forgiveness for their sins or assistance in their needs; the offerings were supposed to intercede on their behalf. Some times a sin was expiated or help was sought by offering even a human sacrifice. They carried this idea of continuation of the life so far as to bury with a man all types of necessities of life, not forgetting his ornaments and arms, in order that he might use them on his onward journey; some times even his concubines and soldiers were buried alive with him to keep him company. You may see a lot of such finds in archaeological museums around the world. Some such ideas have persisted even among the Muslims - with all their diverse cultures and languages, albeit in modified forms.

The Qur'an has rejected all such superstitious beliefs and baseless ideas in no uncertain terms:

. . . and the command on that day shall be entirely Allah's (82:19).

. . . and they see the chastisement and their ties are cut asunder (2:166).

And certainly you have come to Us alone as We created you at first, and you have left behind your backs the things which We gave you, and We do not see with you your intercessors about whom you asserted that they were (Allah's) associates in respect to you; certainly the ties between you are now cut off and what you asserted is gone from you (6:94).

There shall every soul become acquainted with what is sent before, and they shall be brought back to Allah, their true Master and what they did fabricate shall escape from them (10:30).

There are many similar verses; and they show that the life hereafter is cut off from the natural causes which govern this life, and is quite separate from material connections. Once this principle is understood all the above-mentioned myths would automatically be cleared away. But the Qur'an is not content with this general declaration; it refutes each and every myth and superstition described above:

And be on your guard against the day when one soul shall not avail another in the least;- neither shall intercession on its behalf be accepted, nor shall any compensation be taken from it, nor shall they be helped (12:4

. . . . before the day comes in which there is no bargaining, neither any friendship nor intercession (2:254)

The day on which a friend shall not avail (his) friend aught . . . (44:41).

. . . there shall be no savior for you from Allah . . . (40:33).

What is the matter with you that you do not help each other? Nay! On this day they are submissive (37:25 - 26).

And they worship beside Allah what can neither harm them nor profit them, and they say: "These are our intercessors with Allah. " Say: "Do you (presume to) inform Allah of what He knows not in the heavens and the earth?" Glory be to Him, and supremely exalted is He above what they set up with Him. (10: 1.

. . . the unjust shall not have any friend nor any intercessors who should be obeyed (40:1.

So we have no intercessors, nor a true-friend (26:100-101).

There are many other verses of the same theme, all rejecting the intercession on the Day of Resurrection.

On the other hand, the Qur'an does not totally reject the intercession; rather it confirms it to a certain extent. For example, it says:

Allah is He Who created the heavens and the earth and what is between them in six periods and He is firmly established on the throne; you have not besides Him any guardian or any intercessors; will you not then mind? (32:4)

. . . there is no guardian for them, nor any intercessor besides Him (6:51).

Say: Allah's is the intercession altogether" (39:44).

. . . whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth is His; who is he that can intercede with Him but by His permission? He knows what is before them and what is behind them (2:255).

Surely your Lord is Allah, Who created the heavens and the earth in six periods; and He is firmly established on the throne; regulating the affair; there is no intercessor except after His permission (10: 3).

And they say,- "The Beneficent God had taken to Himself a son. “Glory be to Him! Nay! They are honored servants; they do not precede Him in speech and (only) according to His commandment do they act. He knows what is before them and what is behind them, and they do not intercede except for whom He approves, and for fear of Him they tremble (21:26 - 2.

And those whom they call upon besides Him have no authority for intercession, but he who bears witness of the truth, and they know (him) (43:86).

They shall have no authority for intercession, save he who has made a covenant with the Beneficent God (19:87).

On that day shall no intercession avail except of him whom the Beneficent God allows and whose word He is pleased with. He knows what is before them and what is behind them, while they do not comprehend Him in knowledge And intercession will not avail aught with Him save of him whom He permits (34:23).

And how many an angel is there in the heavens whose intercession does not avail at all except after Allah has given permission to whom He pleases and chooses (53: 26).

Some of these verses (like the first three) say that intercession is reserved for Allah, while the rest declare that others too may intercede with Allah's permission. In any case, all of them confirm the intercession per se. How are these verses related to the preceding ones which totally reject intercession? It is exactly the same relation that exists between the verses that say that the knowledge of unseen is reserved to Allah and those which declare that others too may have that knowledge with the permission of Allah. As Allah says:
Say:

"No one in the heaven and the earth knows the unseen but Allah" (27:65).

And with Him are the keys of the unseen, does not know it any except He (6:59).

The Knower of the unseen! So He does not reveal His secrets to any, except to him whom He chooses of an apostle (72:27).

The same is the case with various verses on the subjects of creating, sustaining, giving

death, causality, command, authority and similar effects. Some verses reserve them for Allah, while some say that others too may do these things. It is a well-known style of the Qur'an: first it rejects the idea that anyone other than Allah has any virtue or perfection; thereafter it confirms the same virtue or perfection for others depending on the permission and pleasure of Allah. When read together, the verses show that nobody has any virtue by his own power and right; whatever excellence there may be, he has got it because Allah has given it to him. Allah puts much emphasis to this fact; He attaches the proviso of His will even for those things which are firmly decreed by Him. For example:

So as to those who are unhappy, they shall be in the fire; for them shall be sighing and groaning in it; abiding therein so long as the heavens and the earth endure, except as your Lord please; surely your Lord is the (mighty) doer of what He intends. And as to those who are made happy, they shall be in the garden, abiding in it as long as the heavens and the earth endure, except as your Lord please; a gift which shall never be cut off (11:106 -108).

Note that abiding for ever is made dependent on the pleasure of Allah, even in case of the garden; although it is a gift which shall never be cut off. It emphasizes the fact that even when Allah firmly decrees a thing, it does not pass out of His control or authority;

"Surely your Lord is (mighty) doer of what He intends" (11:107). When Allah SWT gives a thing, it does not go out of His total possession. When He denies some thing to someone, it is not done to protect Himself against any need or poverty! I feel that the alleged contradictions that you have emanate from the misconception or the “thinking within the box” element that one gets used to with regards to human observations and one tends to create a similitude between human abilities to that of Allah SWT. There is never a comparison between the Creator and the created, Mr Sina. If in essence, you want to logically understand the created, one has to start thinking out of the box regarding the Creator. Of course, the Creator being superior to the created will have unique qualities, not otherwise found in the created. Attributing qualities of the created to the Creator would be rather imprudent at the very least.

In short, the verses that reject intercession - albeit talking about the Day of Resurrection - do so in the context of intercession independent of Allah's authority; while the ones proving it, prove it basically for Allah and then, depending on His pleasure, for others.

Thus the intercession is proved for other than Allah with His permission. Hence, Mr Sina, it is clear that intercession per se is the prerogative, solely of Allah SWT and He is the One to choose who shall be interceded for and who shall intercede. He is clear in His statement that there shall be a chosen few who shall have the privilege of intercession, either as intercessors or those to be interceded for. After all, the Lord Almighty, is Master of His will and His will shall be carried out, ….qun fa ya qun.

Is this your proof? You did not say anything new. You rehashed the problem and stated that one has to think out of the box to understand it. Then you appealed to other contradictions in the Quran as evidence and concluded that since similar contradictions exist, this contradiction is not a contradiction.

I fail to see your logic. Thinking out of the box does not mean thinking out of the limits of logic. Logic has a framework that you have to adhere to or your conclusions would be illogical. You quoted all the verses that talk about intercession. In some verses it says no intercession will be accepted. In other verses it says some intercessions will be accepted. So there is a contradiction. What is your solution to this problem? You say we should think out of the box. To think out of the box means to be creative, imaginative, inventive, etc. This is a way to find new solutions to old problems. It is not a way to differentiate truth from falsehood. You can convince yourself of any absurdity by "thinking out of the box" and stepping out of the confines of logic.

This is the problem with believers. They go to extra lengths to make sense out of the senseless and give esoteric meanings to the meaningless. When presented with absurdities, they become imaginative. That is not how you find the truth. The right approach is to stay within the framework of rationality and reject anything that does not fit in that framework. Thinking out of the box when you have to determine the truth or falsehood of a statement is the wrong use of your creativity. These verses contradict each other. Let us say I repeatedly claim that I am the only editor of this site. Then in other places I announce that other people have been given the right to edit. Aren't these two statement contradictory? How can I be the only editor when I have already authorized others to edit? This contradiction is elemental. If you barter a little bit of your faith with rational thinking you too will be able to see that Muhammad has goofed.

Furthermore, you did not even consider the logical fallacy of intercession. A big part of my discussion with Mr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer was about the incongruity of the very notion of intercession. You did not address this problem.

Then we have the verse (39:44) that affirms only Allah can intercede. How does one intercede himself? This does not make sense at all. Is seems that Allah has some sort of personality disorder. Will you please tell us why one would intercede himself? There is something logically wrong here. God is saying, I am the only one who can beg myself to forgive people. Please stop thinking out of the box for heaven's sake. This verse does not make sense.

You say the Qur'an has rejected all superstitious beliefs and baseless ideas. Isn't the Quran itself superstition and baseless? There are countless superstitions, and each contradicts the other. Islam is one of them. The only way one can claim that Islam is not superstition is to show that it is logical. Where is the logic of Islam? Isn't the very notion of Resurrection a baseless superstition? The Day of Resurrection? Is there anything more ridiculous than this? Even the people of Mecca laughed at Muhammad for this asinine claim. It's pathetic that 1400 years later an aspiring doctor should engage in such talks. When you want to find the truth of something you must be rational. This is not the time to be imaginative or think out of the box. Your methodology is wrong. Your approach is wrong. That is why you come to wrong conclusions.

> As regards your argument on 39:19, Is he on whom the word of doom is fulfilled (to be helped), and canst thou (O Muhammad) rescue him who is in the Fire? (Pickthal). This is quite straightforward, Mr Sina. There is one sin that Allah SWT shall never forgive even at the behest of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH); Shirk, Polytheism. Hence this stipulation to the Prophet (PBUH) or to any God-chosen intercessor that none of their intercession shall be of any avail to the one on whom the Fire has been destined, or who is already in the dreaded place. And whoever of them should say:
>
> Surely I am a god besides Him, such a one do We recompense with hell; thus do, We recompense the unjust. (21:25-29).
>
> Ask forgiveness for them (O Muhammad), or ask not forgiveness for them; though thou ask forgiveness for them seventy times Allah will not forgive them That is because they disbelieved in Allah and His messenger, and Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk. (9:80).
>
> I accede to your argument that even the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) shall not be able to intercede on behalf of those who have committed the sin of Shirk. I completely agree with you on this issue, Mr Sina. The Prophet PBUH, also, has his limitations set by the Almighty SWT. I am sure a man of your knowledge and background (tree and apple, if you recall) would be able to understand the injunctions here.
>
> And never (O Muhammad) pray for one of them who dieth, nor stand by his grave. Lo! They disbelieved in Allah and His messenger, and they died while they were evil-doers. (9:84).

Oh dear! Where do I start?

You quote the Quran as if we all agree that this book is the word of God and an undisputable authority. Shouldn't you first prove that Allah is God? How do we know that Allah was not Muhammad's sockpuppet? I have filled this site with evidence that Muhammad was a liar and Allah was nothing but a figment of his imagination, his invisible friend. Why should I care what the Quran says? I am not asking you to prove the existence of God. Let us take that for granted. Where is the proof that Allah is God? Where is the proof that Muhammad was his messenger? How can we be sure that the Quran is not all Satanic Verses? How do we know the ghost that Muhammad saw in the cave was not Satan? Before quoting the Quran and trying to intimidate me with the hellfire, you must first prove the above claims.

Then you say God never forgives *shirk (polytheism)*. Why? Why would the maker of this vast and magnificent universe be so petty and wretched? Why should he care if any two legged creature of this tiny planet worship him at all? This is absurdity. The idea that God would torture humans for eternity because they did not believe in him is lunacy. It is actually blasphemy. It insinuates that God is a needy, insecure, sadist psychopath.

At the time when you should have your feet on the ground and confine your thinking to reason, you think "out of the box" and fly on the wings of fantasy. You believe in Resurrection in which corpses that have been reduced to dust will come back to life. You

believe in a petulant deity who has such low self esteem and is so desperate to be worshipped that he punishes those who don't show him their butts five times a day, excruciatingly, not for one minute or one hour, but for trillions and trillions of years, nay rather for eternity. You believe that an angel brought a message to Muhammad and never wonder how such an absurdity is possible. Is this claim scientific? When it comes to believing in nonsense, you are an "out of the box" thinker. Yet you have such a hard time in freeing your mind from superstitions. Your imaginative power is not just out of the box, but also out of bounds. Yet, your rational ability is stuck in the sand dunes of seventh century Arabia.

If there is no other god but God, why should he care if humans worship something else? Isn't he convinced that there is no other god but him? So why would he get so upset? Is he even jealous of imaginary contenders? Isn't it paranoia and psychopathology? Let us say I and my harem of wives live in an island where I am the only male. Wouldn't you say I am a mad man if I threaten to beat my wives should they look at other men? What other men? If there is no other man but me, why should I be so paranoid? If God is sure of himself he does not need the approval of anybody, least of all his creation.

Muhammad's god is a narcissist. He has the same personality disorder of Hitler, Stalin and Saddam. All these beasts, wanted to be praised, recognized and worshipped. They were despots, did as they pleased, responded to no authority and created a personality cult around themselves. They had zero tolerance for dissent and those who showed any sign of independence. This is how Muhammad depicted Allah. How can the almighty God have the exact same characteristics of narcissists? Therefore Allah cannot be God. Allah was everything Muhammad wanted to be. As a dejected orphan he was desperate for attention, love and respect. He invented Allah and through him he realized his lust for power and grandeur. He could not ask people, to love him and obey him, but he could easily fool the gullible and say love and obey Allah and his messenger; Fighting is good for you, wage war for Allah and his messenger; One fifth of what you loot belongs to Allah and his messenger. Are you sure Muhammad sent Allah's share of the booty to him?

Mr. Sina, the underlined verses of the Holy Quran have a massive logical congruence, if you note, quite clearly. Both quote the essential nature of belief in Allah SWT & the Holy Prophet PBUH, for intercession to hold any water on the final day.

So know (O Muhammad) that there is no Allah save Allah, and ask forgiveness for thy sin and for believing men and believing women. Allah knoweth (both) your place of turmoil and your place of rest. (47:19).

The first part of this verse bears testimony to my preceding paragraph. Allah SWT clearly informs His Prophet, that He is One, and that those who bear witness, in true essence, to His Oneness, be they sinful, shall have the benefit of intercession from the Prophet (PBUH). Allah SWT clearly informs Prophet as to the qualities of those beneficiaries of intercession from him. Of course, by the permission of the Almighty SWT.

And when it is said to them, "Come, the Messenger of Allah will pray for your forgiveness", they turn aside their heads, and thou wouldst see them turning away their faces in arrogance. (63:5)

This verse hold so true even today. Especially when I think of those today turning away from the intercessory favours bestowed on the prophet PBUH by Allah SWT, as if apart from the prophet PBUH, there are other mediums of such intercession. If in event, the powers of intercession of the prophet PBUH are not true, I don't think anyone of us or you, Mr Sina, have anything to lose. We will still remain in our state as we wait for the factual reality of death to overtake us while in our sinful oblivion. But if in event, it is true, and we disbelieve in the same as per 9:80 and 9:84, just imagine the loss we would be in due to our foolishness in disbelief! It is a matter of probability, Mr Sina. As it stands between both of us, it is 50/50, may or may not be true. But, the reality of death is certain. It's the hereafter and God that is in question as far you are concerned, where intercession would come in handy. If your surgeon gave you similar probability for a certain operation's success with death on one side and life on the other, with the operation as a simile for intercession, in this instance, what would you take, Sina? Certain death by avoiding the operation or the half chance of life via the operation? I pray to Allah SWT, you do not have to face such a life and death choice, but the possibility is real. I am sure, given your state of faith, you would take a 10% chance of life on the operating table. 50% chance of success would be a boon to anyone, especially you Sina. The hereafter is not based on probability. If and when it comes to pass and my 50% comes true, and you being as unprepared as you are, I would hate to imagine what you would be going through, six feet under.